



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/509,280	03/20/2000	PETER ROWAN KELLOCK	SPR6147P0010	3713
32116	7590	08/09/2005	EXAMINER	
WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ, CLARK & MORTIMER 500 W. MADISON STREET SUITE 3800 CHICAGO, IL 60661			AN, SHAWN S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2613	

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/509,280

**Applicant(s)**

KELLOCK ET AL.

**Examiner**

Shawn S. An

**Art Unit**

2613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20, 22, 24-43, 45, 47-66, 68, 70-117 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-14, 17, 18, 34-37, 40, 41, 57-59, 63, 64 and 70-99 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 15, 16, 19, 20, 22, 24-33, 38, 39, 42, 43, 45, 47-56, 60-62, 65, 66, 68 and 100-117 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/6/04, 1/19/05</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. As per Applicant's instructions as filed on 3/23/05, a plurality of claims (1-99) have been amended, canceled, and withdrawn, and claims 100-117 have been newly added.

### ***Response to Remarks***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to amended claims have been carefully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection incorporating the previously cited prior art (Abecassis).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 1-2, 9, 15-16, 19-20, 24-25, 32, 38-39, 42-43, 47-48, 55, 60-62, 65-66, 103-104, 109-110, and 115-116 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Abecassis (6,067,401).

**Regarding claims 1, 9, 20, 24, 32, 43, 47, 55, 60, and 66,** Abecassis discloses a system/method and a computer program code means (col. 4, lines 56-65) for processing video segment, comprising:

- means for obtaining at least one descriptor value for each of a plurality of segments of the input video signal (Fig. 2);

- means for using a selection rule and the descriptor values to select, from among the plurality of video segments, at least two segments (Fig. 8C, 825); and

- means for using a sequencing (824) rule and the descriptor values of the at least two selected video segments to derive a sequencing order in which to present the at least two video segments, wherein the new sequence being different (non-sequential) from the sequence of the segments in the input video signal (col. 23, lines 1-14); and

- means for assembling (Fig. 8C, 825) an output video production by including the selected video segments in the selected order.

**Regarding claims 2, 25, and 48,** Abecassis discloses two grids corresponding to representations of the at least two video segments for a first/second axis, wherein each cell in the grid displays a value ascribed to one of at least one descriptors (Fig. 2A).

**Regarding claims 15, 38, and 61,** Abecassis discloses means for segmenting a video input by enabling definition or adjustment of start and end times of a video segment by direct user manipulation (Fig. 1).

**Regarding claims 16, 39, and 62,** Abecassis discloses means (Fig. 2A) for deriving a single value from a plurality of values of a descriptor corresponding to video segments.

**Regarding claims 19, 42, and 65,** Abecassis discloses providing playback of the output video production (abs.).

**Regarding claims 103, 109, and 115,** Abecassis discloses:

- means for obtaining a first descriptor value for each of segments (Fig. 2);

- means for ascribing at least one second descriptor value to at least a first of the segments (823); and

Art Unit: 2613

means for grouping the first segment with at least one other of the segments according to the values of the first descriptor value (825); and

means for selectively copying the second descriptor value to one or more other segment (abs.).

**Regarding claims 104, 110, and 116, Abecassis discloses:**

display means for allowing a user to view the output production (Fig. 8C, see VIEW);

data input means for receiving instructions from the user to modify at least one of the descriptor values (Fig. 9, 933); and

a modified output production based on the modified descriptor values (941).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3-8, 10, 22, 26-31, 33, 45, 49-54, 56, 68, 100-102, 105-108, 111-114, and 117 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abecassis (6,067,401).

**Regarding claims 105, 111, and 117, Abecassis discloses a system/method and a computer program code means (col. 4, lines 56-65) for creating an output video production from an input video signal, comprising:**

means for obtaining at least time two time series descriptors representing the value of a characteristic of the input video signal at each of a series of successive time periods (Fig. 2B, 230)

means for using at least one of the time series descriptors for deriving a set of segment boundary times defining a plurality of segments of the input video signal, (Fig. 2B, 230; col. 8, lines 33-45).

means for applying a descriptor reduction rule (220, TABLE Category) to at least a second one of the time series descriptors to obtain at least one segment descriptor for each of the segments, wherein the segment descriptor have a single value (Fig. 2B, see 1, 2, 3, and/or 4) for each respective segment of the input video signal;

means for using a selection rule and the descriptor values to select, from among the plurality of video segments, at least two segments (Fig. 8C, 825); and

means for assembling (Fig. 8C, 825) an output video production by including the selected video segments.

Abecassis does not seem to particularly disclose automatically obtaining a reduced descriptor having a single value of the respective segment of the input signal.

However, since Abecassis teaches the reduced descriptor having a single value of the respective segment of the input signal as discussed above, and flexibility of providing descriptive structures that permits automatic application of a viewer's preference to a variety of programs by assigning unique codes to each set of categories (col. 9, lines 7-15), and the fact that this invention relates to an automatic retrieval of video segments of a video program (col. 1, lines 14-19), it would have been considered obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the relevant art to envision automatically obtaining a reduced descriptor having a single value of the respective segment of the input signal as an efficient way to classify the corresponding video segment into a descriptor value.

**Regarding claims 3, 26, and 49,** Abecassis discloses a row visually representing at least two video segments, and time-series graphical representation of a plurality of values of a descriptor corresponding to one of at least two video segments, wherein the temporal (230) extent of each of the at least two video segments is indicated (Fig. 2B).

Abecassis does not particularly disclose an audio content of the video segments.

However, the Examiner takes official notice that a row comprising an audio content of the video segments is well known in the art (see also UK 2,329,812).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art employing a system for processing video segment as taught by Abecassis to incorporate the well known concept of audio content of the video segments for the purpose of an audio editing.

**Regarding claims 4, 27, and 50**, Abecassis discloses first and second grids, wherein a change to the original first grid causes a corresponding change to the second grid (Fig. 2).

**Regarding claims 5-6, 28-29, and 51-52**, the Examiner takes official notice that creating dissolve or an audio cross fade is a well known feature in a scene analysis.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art employing a system for processing video segment as taught by Abecassis to incorporate the well known concept as discussed above for the purpose of creating a smooth transitions between two video segments.

**Regarding claims 7, 30, and 53**, Abecassis discloses importing a descriptor and at least one value ascribed thereto prior to importation into the system (Fig. 2A).

**Regarding claims 8, 31, and 54**, Abecassis discloses means for performing an automatic signal analysis of the each of the segments of the input signal and ascribing at least one value thereto based on the analysis (Fig. 9; col. 23, lines 18-44).

**Regarding claims 10, 33, and 56**, the Examiner takes official notice that it is an obvious feature to include a formula or algorithm having a reference to at least one other descriptor so as to compare the reference descriptor value with a desired change value by an user.

**Regarding claims 22, 45, and 68**, the Examiner takes official notice that conventionally deriving a target or a reference or a threshold value is well known in the art as a comparison basis to define a certain condition for a data/value.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art employing a system for processing video segment as taught by Abecassis to sequence

Art Unit: 2613

video segments according to the difference between values of at least one descriptor and a target value.

**Regarding claims 100-101, 106-107, and 112-113**, since Abecassis discloses selecting and sequencing at least two video segments, it would have been obvious to apply a predetermined set of selection and sequencing rules as a set of guideline for selecting and sequencing video segments.

**Regarding claims 102, 108, and 114**, Abecassis discloses obtaining at least two time series descriptors for deriving a set of boundary times defining the segments of the input video signal, and further discloses that an editor has complete control as to the video material to which a viewer is exposed such as time, and amount of viewing control (Fig. 2B, 230; col. 23, lines 15-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to obtain at least one descriptor value for each segment of the input video signal automatically by using at least a second of the time series descriptors as an efficient way to obtain descriptor values.

### **Conclusion**

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to *Shawn S. An* whose telephone number is 571-272-7324.



Art Unit: 2613

9. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Please note new fax number.

10. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



**SHAWN AN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

8/04/05